Entropic uncertainty relations for successive measurements of canonically conjugate observables

Alexey E. Rastegin
Department of Theoretical Physics, Irkutsk State University, Gagarin Bv. 20, Irkutsk 664003, Russia

Uncertainties in successive measurements of general canonically conjugate variables are examined. Such operators are approached within a limiting procedure of the Pegg–Barnett type. Dealing with unbounded observables, we should take into account a finiteness of detector resolution. An appropriate reformulation of two scenarios of successive measurements is proposed and motivated. Uncertainties are characterized by means of generalized entropies of both the Rényi and Tsallis types. The Rényi and Tsallis formulations of uncertainty relations are obtained for both the scenarios of successive measurements of canonically conjugate operators. Entropic uncertainty relations for the case of position and momentum are separately discussed.

arXiv:1604.08682v3 [quant-ph] 29 Sep 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle [1] has been recognized as one of the fundamental scientific concepts. The Heisenberg's thought experiment was first examined rather qualitatively. An explicit formal derivation was firstly given in [2]: the product of the standard deviations of position and momentum in the same state cannot be less than $\hbar/2$. To arbitrary pair of observables, this approach was extended by Robertson [3]. This very traditional formulation has been criticized [4, 5]. It gives no characterization, when a prepared state commutes with any of the two observables. The first entropic uncertainty relation for position and momentum was derived by Hirschman from the Hausdorff–Young inequality [6]. His result has later been improved in [7, 8]. The improved relation was used in derivation of entanglement criteria for continuous variables [9]. Entropic relations in multi-dimensional position and momentum spaces were obtained in [10]. In the discrete case, entropic approach yields a non-trivial restriction whenever the two observables do not share any common eigenvector [5]. Entropic uncertainty relations are currently the subject of active research (see the reviews [11–13] and references therein). Questions of their optimality are addressed in [14]. Other approaches are based on the sum of variances [15, 16] and on majorization relations [17–21]. The variance-based formulation was recently applied to noise and disturbance [22]. Measure-independent notions of joint uncertainty of several variables are studied in [23].

The most traditional formulation known as preparation uncertainty relations assumes repeated trials with the same state. For each of the chosen measurements, the corresponding probability distribution is taken. Using some quantitative figures of uncertainty, we then study bounds on the total measure of uncertainty in the scenario. Of course, other measurement scenarios could be considered here. Some of them are related to the case of successive measurements [24, 25]. At each stage, an actual pre-measurement state somehow depends on the results of previous measurements. In a certain sense, this situation is more realistic in the context of quantum information processing. Uncertainty relations are now interesting not only from the conceptual viewpoint. These studies are stimulated by a recent progress in using quantum systems as an informational resource [26–28]. Today, physicists are able to carry out experiments with individual quantum systems [29, 30]. In quantum information processing, our subsequent manipulations usually deal with an output of the latter stage. The Heisenberg's thought experiment with microscope should rather be treated as a scenario of measurement uncertainty in successive measurements [31]. Apparently, studies of quantum uncertainties in the scenarios of successive measurements have received less attention than they deserve [25]. The authors of [25] also discussed links between uncertainties in successive measurements and Ozawa's treatment of noise and disturbance [32, 33].

For the scenarios of successive measurements, entropic uncertainty relations were considered only in finite-dimensional settings [24, 34]. For a pair of qubit observables, this approach was further developed with the use of Rényi's entropies [35] and Tsallis' entropies [36]. In the present work, we will deal with successive measurements that are not projective. The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we review the required material concerning entropic functions and application of the Pegg–Barnett formalism to canonical conjugacy. In Section III, we discuss the two scenarios of successive measurements of canonically conjugate operators. This reformulation is necessary since we consider observables with continuous spectra. Entropic measures of uncertainty also differ somehow from the measures used in the discrete case. In Section IV, we derive Rényi and Tsallis formulations of uncertainty relations for both the scenarios of successive measurements of canonically conjugate operators. The position-momentum case is separately addressed. In Section V, we conclude the paper with a brief summary of results obtained.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we recall the required material and fix the notation. Uncertainties will be characterized via the Rényi and Tsallis entropies, which have many convenient

properties [37]. Then we consider necessary details of the Pegg–Barnett formalism.

Let us consider distributions with a discrete label. For the given probability distribution $\mathsf{p} = \{p_i\}$, its Rényi α-entropy is defined as [38]

$$R_\alpha(\mathsf{p}) := \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\ln\left(\sum\nolimits_i p_i^\alpha\right), \tag{1}$$

where $0 < \alpha \neq 1$. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, the Rényi α-entropy is a concave function of the probability distribution. For $\alpha > 1$, it is neither purely convex nor purely concave [39]. In the limit $\alpha \to 1$, the formula (1) gives the standard Shannon entropy

$$H_1(\mathsf{p}) = -\sum\nolimits_i p_i \ln p_i\ . \tag{2}$$

For the given probability distribution $\mathsf{p} = \{p_i\}$ and any $0 < \alpha \neq 1$, the Tsallis α-entropy is defined as [40]

$$\begin{aligned} H_\alpha(\mathsf{p}) &:= \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\,\left(\sum\nolimits_i p_i^\alpha - 1\right) \\ &= -\sum\nolimits_i p_i^\alpha\ \ln_\alpha(p_i)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Here, the α-logarithm is given by

$$\ln_\alpha(\xi) := \frac{\xi^{1-\alpha}-1}{1-\alpha}\ . \tag{4}$$

Note that the α-entropy (3) is concave for all $0 < \alpha \neq 1$. For $\alpha \to 1$, the α-logarithm reduces to the usual one so that (3) reduces to (2).

In view of non-additivity, the Tsallis entropy is well known in non-extensive thermostatistics [40]. Up to a factor, the α-entropy (3) is actually identical to an information measure introduced earlier in [41]. Incidentally, entropic functions of this type have found use far beyond the context of thermostatistics. For instance, such information measures were applied in formulation of Bell inequalities [42] and in studies of combinatorial problems [43].

In the following, we will use a convenient notion similar to vector norms. For $\beta > 0$, we define

$$\|\mathsf{p}\|_\beta := \left(\sum\nolimits_i p_i^\beta\right)^{1/\beta}. \tag{5}$$

The right-hand side of (5) gives a norm only for $\beta \geq 1$. For $\alpha \neq 1$, one can rewrite (1) in the form

$$R_\alpha(\mathsf{p}) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\ \ln\|\mathsf{p}\|_\alpha\ . \tag{6}$$

The α-entropy (3) is expressed in terms of $\|\mathsf{p}\|_\alpha$ as well.

Let us proceed to the case of continuously changed variables. In principle, the formulas (1) and (3) can be rewritten immediately. If the variable is distributed according to the probability density function $w(y)$, then

$$R_\alpha(w) := \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\ \ln\left(\int [w(y)]^\alpha \mathrm{d}y\right), \tag{7}$$

where $0 < \alpha \neq 1$. The integral is assumed to be taken over the interval of values, for which $w(y)$ is defined. As a rule, such intervals are clear from the context. It will be convenient to extend the notion (5) to the case of probability density functions. For the given density function $w(y)$ and $\beta > 0$, we define

$$\|w\|_\beta := \left(\int [w(y)]^\beta \mathrm{d}y\right)^{1/\beta}. \tag{8}$$

Using entropies of the form (7), the following fact should be kept in mind. In general, they may have negative values. This is a distinction from (1) and (3). Since $p_i \leq 1$, for $\alpha > 1 > \beta$ we easily obtain

$$\|\mathsf{p}\|_\alpha \leq 1 \leq \|\mathsf{p}\|_\beta\ . \tag{9}$$

For probability density functions, we cannot generally write relations similarly to (9). If $w(y) \leq 1$ for all acceptable values of y, then we truly have

$$\|w\|_\alpha \leq 1 \leq \|w\|_\beta\ . \tag{10}$$

The latter follows from the normalization $\|w\|_1 = 1$ and $\alpha > 1 > \beta$. It can be exemplified that the property (10) is not valid for density functions with sufficiently large variations.

To quantify an amount of uncertainty, we rather wish to deal with positive entropic functions. Here, one of possible approaches is to use some discretization. An interval of continuously changed variable can be divided into a set of non-intersecting bins. Preparation uncertainty relations with binning were derived by Białynicki-Birula in terms of the Shannon [44] and Rényi entropies [45]. Such relations can be applied to entanglement [46] and steering detection [47, 48]. To reach a good exposition, the size of the bins should be sufficiently small in comparison with a scale of considerable changes of the distribution. Let the bins be described by the set of marks $\{\ell_i\}$. Accordingly, we have the intervals $\Delta\ell_i = \ell_{i+1} - \ell_i$ with the maximum $\Delta\ell = \max\Delta\ell_i$. We introduce probabilities

$$p_i^{(\ell)} := \int_{\ell_i}^{\ell_{i+1}} w(y)\,\mathrm{d}y\ , \tag{11}$$

which form the distribution $\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\ell)}$. For this probability distribution, we can then calculate the entropies (1) and (3). For sufficiently small bins, these entropies will provide a good characteristic of uncertainty.

To obtain entropic relations with binning, we will use the inequalities following from theorem 192 of the book by Hardy et al. [49]. For $\alpha > 1 > \beta$, we have [50]

$$\Delta\ell^{1-\alpha}\left\|\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\ell)}\right\|_\alpha^\alpha \leq \|w\|_\alpha^\alpha\ , \tag{12}$$

$$\|w\|_\beta^\beta \leq \Delta\ell^{1-\beta}\left\|\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\ell)}\right\|_\beta^\beta\ . \tag{13}$$

Rényi's entropies of $\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\ell)}$ are generally unbounded, when $\Delta\ell \to 0$ and the other parameters remain fixed. It is

seen from (12) and (13). In this limit, we will deal with entropies of continuous distributions such as (7).

To describe canonically conjugate operators, the Pegg–Barnett formalism [51–53] will be used. This approach was originally proposed to fit a Hermitian phase operator. Since Dirac's famous work [54] on quantum electrodynamics had appeared, the quantum phase problem has extensively been studied [55]. Dirac's treatment of a quantum phase operator was later found to suffer from a lot of difficulties [56]. A renewed interest in the quantum phase problem was stimulated by a progress in quantum optics [55]. There is a large literature on many aspects of this problem [55, 56].

Instead of infinite dimensions, the Pegg–Barnett formalism begins with a finite but arbitrarily large state space [51, 52]. The final part of the procedure is to find the limit of desired quantities as the dimensionality tends to infinity. Furthermore, the concept of canonical conjugacy can be explained from this viewpoint [57]. It gives additional insights into the nature of canonically conjugate operators in physically relevant situations. The notion of complementarity in finite dimensions is shown to be related with complementarity in the sense of canonical conjugacy. Entropic uncertainty relations for general canonically conjugate operators were studied in [58] and by another method in [50].

We consider the two orthonormal bases $\{|n\rangle\}_{n=0}^{d}$ and $\{|m\rangle\}_{m=0}^{d}$ in $(d+1)$-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{d+1}$. The authors of [57] introduced two Hermitian operators with the same structure:

$$\mathsf{N}_{d+1} := \sum_{n=0}^{d} n\,|n\rangle\langle n| \;, \tag{14}$$

$$\mathsf{M}_{d+1} := \sum_{m=0}^{d} m\,|m\rangle\langle m| \;. \tag{15}$$

They are formally similar to the photon number operator and both have the spectrum $\{0, 1, \ldots, d\}$. To build conjugate observables, the considered orthonormal bases should obey

$$\langle n|m\rangle = (d+1)^{-1/2}\,\exp\bigl(\mathtt{i}h(m,n)\bigr) \;. \tag{16}$$

The real-valued function $h(m,n)$ is defined as $h(m,n) = -(m+b_0)(n+a_0)\delta$, where [57]

$$\delta = \frac{2\pi}{d+1} \;. \tag{17}$$

The parameters a_0 and b_0 will be specified later. Here, we deal with a pair of mutually unbiased bases, whose role in quantum physics was emphasized by Schwinger [59]. The above operators generate shifts in each other's eigenstates [57]:

$$\exp\Bigl(-\mathtt{i}(\mathsf{N}_{d+1} + a_0\mathbb{1}_{d+1})j\delta\Bigr)|m\rangle = |m+j\rangle \;, \tag{18}$$

$$\exp\Bigl(+\mathtt{i}(\mathsf{M}_{d+1} + b_0\mathbb{1}_{d+1})k\delta\Bigr)|n\rangle = |n+k\rangle \;. \tag{19}$$

The relations (18) and (19) give a hint for the proper form of the operators with conjugacy. For a real parameter γ, we define

$$\mathsf{X}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)} := (\mathsf{N}_{d+1} + a_0\mathbb{1}_{d+1})\gamma \;, \tag{20}$$

$$\mathsf{Y}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)} := (\mathsf{M}_{d+1} + b_0\mathbb{1}_{d+1})\delta\gamma^{-1} \;, \tag{21}$$

These operators should become canonically conjugate for $d \to \infty$. The eigenvalues of the operators (20) and (21) are written as $x_n = (a_0+n)\gamma$ and $y_m = (b_0+m)\delta\gamma^{-1}$, respectively. The differences between successive eigenvalues are $\Delta x_n = \gamma$ and $\Delta y_m = \delta\gamma^{-1}$. The parameters a_0, b_0, and γ are functions of the dimensionality and should be chosen appropriately [57, 58].

To approach canonical conjugacy, the two possible situations should be kept in mind [57]. In the first one, the difference between successive eigenvalues of (20) does not vanish as $d \to \infty$. Accordingly, $\gamma(d)$ should tend to a non-zero finite limit. In the second case, the conjugate observables both have continuous spectra. We will focus just on this case, which includes the position-momentum pair. When $d \to \infty$, the parameter $\gamma(d)$ approaches zero so that $(d+1)\gamma$ tends to infinity. It might be inversely proportional to a power of $(d+1)$ which is between, but not including, zero and unity [57]. To provide infinite expansion of spectra in both the negative and positive directions, we could set $a_0(d) = b_0(d) = -d/2$ [57].

The commutator of (21) and (20) is expressed as

$$\bigl[\mathsf{Y}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)}, \mathsf{X}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)}\bigr] = \delta\,[\mathsf{M}_{d+1}, \mathsf{N}_{d+1}] \;. \tag{22}$$

To approach canonical conjugacy, certain physical conditions should be imposed [57]. Here, the first physical condition implies that one cannot prepare a state of infinite energy or momentum. Under such restrictions, the right-hand side of (22) reduces to the form [57]

$$\mathtt{i}\Bigl(\mathbb{1}_{d+1} - (d+1)|m=0\rangle\langle m=0|\Bigr) \;. \tag{23}$$

The ket $|m=0\rangle$ corresponds to the minimal eigenvalue $y_0 = b_0\delta\gamma^{-1}$ of $\mathsf{Y}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)}$. Except for the term with this ket, the right-hand side of (23) reproduces the standard commutation relation. The units here are such that $\hbar = 1$. The form (23) is sufficient for the first case of canonical conjugacy, including the photon phase-number pair and the angle-angular momentum pair [57]. To approach the second case, an additional condition is required. The relation (23) can finally be reduced to the form

$$\bigl[\mathsf{Y}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)}, \mathsf{X}_{d+1}^{(\gamma)}\bigr]_{PP} = \mathtt{i}\mathbb{1}_{d+1} \;. \tag{24}$$

It implies that the system must be in a state with a finite extension in space, or, more generally, with finite moments with respect to (21) [57]. The subscripts in (24) emphasize the role of the above physical conditions. To derive entropic uncertainty relations, we will focus on norm-like functionals of the corresponding probability distributions. Connections between them follow from Riesz's theorem [60] (see also theorem 297 of [49]).

III. ON SUCCESSIVE MEASUREMENTS OF OBSERVABLES IN GENERAL

In this section, the problem of uncertainty in quantum measurements is considered for two successive measurements. Successive projective measurements are physically meaningful only for observables with purely discrete spectra. In this paper, we focus on observables with continuous spectra. This case should be treated in essentially different manner [25]. As the case of projective measurements is conceptually simpler, we briefly recall it.

Let A be a finite-dimensional observable, and let Λ_a be the projector onto the a-th eigenspace of A. For the pre-measurement state $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, the probability of outcome a is equal to $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_a\boldsymbol{\rho})$ [61]. With this probability distribution, we calculate entropic functions or other quantities of interest. By $R_\alpha(\mathsf{A};\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and $H_\alpha(\mathsf{A};\boldsymbol{\rho})$, we will mean the entropies (1) and (3) calculated with $\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_a\boldsymbol{\rho})$. Suppose that we further measure another observable B. In the scenarios of successive measurements, subsequent measurements are assumed to be performed with a new ensemble of states. This formulation quite differs from the tradition of preparation uncertainty relations.

Scenarios with successive measurement are formulated with respect to the chosen form of post-first-measurement states [34]. In the first scenario, the second measurement is performed on the state generated after the first measurement with completely erased information. In terms of the projectors Λ_a, the pre-measurement state of the second measurement is expressed as [24]

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum\nolimits_a \Lambda_a\boldsymbol{\rho}\Lambda_a \ . \tag{25}$$

To quantify the amount of uncertainty in successive measurements, we will use quantities of the form

$$R_\alpha(\mathsf{A};\boldsymbol{\rho}) + R_\beta\big(\mathsf{B};\Phi_{\mathsf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \ , \tag{26}$$

and similarly with the corresponding Tsallis entropies.

The second scenario of successive measurements assumes that the result of the first measurement should be kept. A focus on actual measurement outcomes is typical for the so-called selective measurements. For example, incoherent selective measurements are used in the formulation of monotonicity of coherence measures [62]. Note that coherence quantifiers can be defined with entropic functions of the Tsallis type [63].

Thus, the second measurement is performed on the post-first-measurement state conditioned on the actual measurement outcome [34, 35]. It is represented as $\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a = r_a^{-1}\Lambda_a\boldsymbol{\rho}\Lambda_a$, where $r_a = \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda_a\boldsymbol{\rho})$. Measuring the second observable B in each $\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a$, we deal with the corresponding entropy $R_\beta(\mathsf{B};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a)$. Taking the average over all a, we introduce the quantity

$$\sum\nolimits_a r_a\, R_\beta(\mathsf{B};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a) = \sum\nolimits_a r_a\, R_\alpha(\mathsf{A};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a) + \sum\nolimits_a r_a\, R_\beta(\mathsf{B};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a) \ . \tag{27}$$

Note that the first sum in the right-hand side of (27) is zero. Indeed, measuring the observable A in its eigenstate leads to a deterministic probability distribution, whence $R_\alpha(\mathsf{A};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a) = 0$ for all a. Thus, in finite dimensions the left-hand side of (27) is sufficient. This is not the case for observables with continuous spectra. We cannot say about a state, in which the measurement of position gives exactly one particular value. Such states can be neither measured nor prepared. Instead, we have to deal with well localized states of finite, even small, scale. So, the right-hand side of (27) will be useful in formulating the second scenario to canonically conjugate variables.

In a similar manner, we can rewrite (27) with the use of Tsallis' entropies. For $\alpha = \beta = 1$, the quantity (27) becomes the Shannon entropy averaged over all a. The authors of [34] applied the latter as a measure of uncertainties in successive measurements. Uncertainty relations for successive projective measurements in terms of Rényi's entropies were examined in [35]. Formally, the sums involved in (27) are very similar to one of the existing definitions of conditional Rényi's entropy. Note that the proper definition of generalized conditional entropies is an open question. There are several more or less justified approaches [64]. The simplest of them just lead to expressions of the form (27). Also, the two kinds of conditional Tsallis entropy are known in the literature [65, 66]. The second form gives the quantity

$$\sum\nolimits_a r_a\, H_\beta(\mathsf{B};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a) \ . \tag{28}$$

The conditional entropies mentioned above were used in studying trade-off relations for noise and disturbance in finite dimensions [67]. More properties of generalized conditional entropies are discussed in [68].

When we deal with unbounded operators, the formulation should be changed. Any real measurement apparatus is inevitably of a finite size. Devices with a finite extension need a finite amount of energy. Therefore, we cannot ask for some state, in which the measurement of an observable gives exactly one particular value. Of course, eigentates of position and momentum are often used as a very convenient mathematical tool. They are not elements of the Hilbert space, but can be treated in the context of rigged Hilbert spaces [69]. In practice, we may deal with narrow distributions that are of finite but small width. Measuring or preparing some state with the particular value ζ of position, one has to be affected by some vicinity of ζ. Therefore, we should treat each concrete result only as an estimation. With more details, measurements of coordinates of a microparticle are considered in chapter II of [70].

To formulate the case of finite-resolution measurements, new operators will be used. Let Y be an observable with $\mathrm{spec}(\mathsf{Y}) = \mathbb{R}$, and let $|y\rangle$'s be the eigenkets normalized through Dirac's delta function. For some "acceptance function" $\zeta \mapsto f(\zeta)$, we define [25]

$$\mathsf{K}(\zeta) := \int \mathrm{d}y\, f(\zeta - y)\, |y\rangle\langle y| \ . \tag{29}$$

If the function f obeys the normalization condition

$$\int |f(\zeta)|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\zeta = 1 \ , \tag{30}$$

then the operators (29) satisfy

$$\int \mathrm{d}\zeta \, \mathsf{K}(\zeta)^\dagger \mathsf{K}(\zeta) = \mathbb{1} \ . \tag{31}$$

The acceptance function characterizes a degree of resolution of the used measurement apparatus. From the physical viewpoint, we may also assume that this function is even. When it is sufficiently narrow, repeated trials with the pre-measurement state will lead to a good estimation of the true probability density function

$$w_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(y) = \langle y|\boldsymbol{\rho}|y\rangle \ . \tag{32}$$

The experiment actually results in other density function. This fact is also essential in deriving uncertainty relations for characteristic functions [71], where aperture transmittance functions have been taken into account. The probability density function dealt with is given by

$$P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta) = \int |f(\zeta - y)|^2 \, w_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(y) \, \mathrm{d}y \ . \tag{33}$$

Due to (33), the dispersion of measured variable will be added by the quantity [25]

$$\sigma_f^2 = \int \zeta^2 \, |f(\zeta)|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \ . \tag{34}$$

For good acceptance functions, any actual distortion of statistics will be small. One of physically natural forms of acceptance functions is the Gauss function [25]. A physically natural assumption is that a behavior of any acceptance function is qualitatively similar. Even if it is narrow, its tails are both non-zero, whence the density (33) cannot take zero values exactly.

We shall now reformulate the first scenario of successive measurements in the finite-resolution case. As was mentioned in [25], the formula (25) is replaced with

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \int \mathrm{d}\zeta \, \mathsf{K}(\zeta) \boldsymbol{\rho} \, \mathsf{K}(\zeta)^\dagger \ . \tag{35}$$

Note that the state (35) leads to the same probability density function (32). But the latter is not directly observable. As a consequence, the state (35) generates the same distribution (33). The post-first-measurement state (35) is further put into a finite-resolution apparatus for the measurement of another observable X. This second measurement is described in a similar manner. Let $|x\rangle$'s be the eigenkets normalized also through Dirac's delta function. The corresponding "acceptance function" $\xi \mapsto g(\xi)$ leads to operators of the form

$$\mathsf{L}(\xi) := \int \mathrm{d}x \, g(\xi - x) \, |x\rangle\langle x| \ . \tag{36}$$

Again, we cannot exactly determine the distribution with respect to x in any measured state. The variable ξ is treated as an estimation, for which the probability density function is expressed similarly to (33). In the first scenario, this density function is calculated with the post-first-measurement state (35).

To characterize an amount of uncertainty in the first scenario of successive measurements, we will introduce an analog of (26). In both the measurements, obtained statistics actually deals with some estimation parameter. Hence, actual probability density function should be taken into account. Using entropies of continuous distributions, we will deal with the quantity

$$R_\alpha\big(P; \boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + R_\beta\big(Q; \Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \ . \tag{37}$$

Here, the Rényi entropies are calculated due to (7) by substituting the probability density functions $P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)$ and

$$Q(\xi) = \int |g(\xi - x)|^2 \, \langle x|\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})|x\rangle \, \mathrm{d}x \ . \tag{38}$$

Another convenient approach is to calculate entropies with binning. For instance, sampling of the function (33) into bins between marks ζ'_j leads to a discrete probability distribution $\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')}$. In the second measurement, entropies can be taken with binning between some marks ξ'_k. This approach leads to the characteristic quantity

$$R_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')}; \boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + R_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')}; \Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \ , \tag{39}$$

and similarly for the case of Tsallis entropies. Entropic quantities of the form (39) provide a natural measure of uncertainty in successive measurements of operators with continuous spectra.

In the second scenario of successive measurements, each actual result of the first measurement is retained. Assuming $P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta) \neq 0$ in the corresponding domain, we now consider the normalized output state

$$\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta) = P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)^{-1} \, \mathsf{K}(\zeta) \boldsymbol{\rho} \, \mathsf{K}(\zeta)^\dagger \ . \tag{40}$$

Each $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$ describes one of possible pre-measurement states in the second measurement. Similarly to (37), we then consider

$$\int R_\alpha\big(P; \boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\zeta + \int R_\beta\big(Q; \boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \ . \tag{41}$$

The entropies $R_\alpha\big(P; \boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big)$ and $R_\beta\big(Q; \boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big)$ are obtained with the probability density functions $P(\tilde{\zeta})$ and $Q(\tilde{\xi})$ determined for the given $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$. We further take the sum of entropies with binning for each $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$ and then average it over all ζ. So, one introduces the quantity

$$\int R_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')}; \boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\zeta + \int R_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')}; \boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\zeta \ . \tag{42}$$

The expressions (41) and (42) generalize (27) to the case of observables with continuous spectra. In opposite to

observables with discrete spectra, any state $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$ is associated with some uncertainty, even small, in the first variable. The first term in each of the sums (41) and (42) is used to quantify this feature. It is for this reason that the right-hand side of (27) be written with adding zero term $R_\alpha(\mathsf{A};\boldsymbol{\varrho}_a)$. Its integral analog is strictly non-zero in each of the sums (41) and (42). Furthermore, we may expect here some trade-off with the second integral. The Tsallis-entropy version of uncertainty measure for the second scenario is written similarly.

IV. ENTROPIC UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS FOR SUCCESSIVE MEASUREMENTS

In the preparation scenario, entropic uncertainty relations for general canonically conjugate operators were proved in [50]. Such operators are obtained within the Pegg–Barnett formalism as was explained in Section II. Let strictly positive numbers α and β obey $1/\alpha+1/\beta=2$ and $\alpha>1>\beta$. For any reference state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, one has [50]

$$\|w_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\alpha \le \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{(1-\beta)/\beta} \|W_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\beta \ , \tag{43}$$

$$\|W_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\alpha \le \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{(1-\beta)/\beta} \|w_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\beta \ . \tag{44}$$

Here, the probability density function $w_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(y)$ is given by substituting $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ into (32), and $W_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(x)=\langle x|\boldsymbol{\sigma}|x\rangle$. The inequalities (43) and (44) were derived by taking the limit $d\to\infty$ in relations between functionals of discrete probability distributions. From the mathematical viewpoint, the derivation resembles the way by which the Hausdorff–Young inequality follows from Riesz's theorem (see, e.g., § 8.17 of [49]). In practice, we will deal with the probability density functions with respect to either ζ or ξ. The next step is to rewrite (43) and (44) in terms of actually measured distributions.

Here, we recall one result for integral mean values with a weight function (see theorem 204 of the book [49]). It is similar to Jensen's inequality. Let the weight function $\lambda(y)$ be normalized. If $\phi''(t)$ is positive for all t between $\inf w(y)$ and $\sup w(y)$, then

$$\phi\Big(\int \lambda(y)\, w(y)\, \mathrm{d}y\Big) \le \int \lambda(y)\, \phi\big(w(y)\big)\, \mathrm{d}y \ . \tag{45}$$

This holds under a lot of technical conditions concerning positivity and integrability of functions. In our case, these conditions are all satisfied. For $\alpha>1$, the function $t\mapsto t^\alpha$ has positive second derivative. Applying (45) with $\lambda(y)=|f(\zeta-y)|^2$, we then get

$$[P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\zeta)]^\alpha \le \int |f(\zeta-y)|^2\, [w_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(y)]^\alpha \mathrm{d}y \ . \tag{46}$$

Integrating this inequality over ζ and using (30), one gets

$$\|P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\alpha^\alpha \le \|w_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\alpha^\alpha \ . \tag{47}$$

For $0<\beta<1$, the function $t\mapsto t^\beta$ has negative second derivative. In a similar manner, for the probability density functions $W_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(x)$ and

$$Q_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\xi) = \int |g(\xi-x)|^2\, W_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(x)\, \mathrm{d}x \ , \tag{48}$$

we write $\|W_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\beta^\beta \le \|Q_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\beta^\beta$. Combining the last two inequalities with (43) and (44) finally gives

$$\|P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\alpha \le \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{(1-\beta)/\beta} \|Q_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\beta \ , \tag{49}$$

$$\|Q_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\alpha \le \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^{(1-\beta)/\beta} \|P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_\beta \ , \tag{50}$$

where $1/\alpha+1/\beta=2$ and $\alpha>1>\beta$. These relations initially hold for the preparation scenario with arbitrary reference state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. However, they are still valid for two different states that have the same probability density function in one of the two measured observables.

Formulating entropic uncertainty relations for successive measurements, we begin with the second scenario. Let $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$ be one of particular outputs of the first measurement, in which we have measured Y. Substituting $\boldsymbol{\sigma}=\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$ and taking the logarithm of (49) and (50), we finally obtain

$$R_\alpha\big(P;\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) + R_\beta\big(Q;\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) \ge \ln 2\pi \ . \tag{51}$$

We now average (51) with the probability density function $P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)$ calculated for the input $\boldsymbol{\rho}$. Under the condition $1/\alpha+1/\beta=2$, one gets

$$\int R_\alpha\big(P;\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\zeta + \int R_\beta\big(Q;\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big) P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\zeta \ge \ln 2\pi \ . \tag{52}$$

The relation differs from relations for finite-dimensional observables in the following respect. Eigenstates of an observable with continuous spectra are unphysical and cannot be prepared. For each particular output of the first measurement, measuring the same observable on $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$ will lead to some distribution of outcomes. A width of this distribution is always non-zero, though small for a good acceptance function. Moreover, our attempts to reduce values of the first integral will lead to increasing lower bound on the second integral. This question does not appear in successive measurements of observables with pure point spectra. Indeed, the first sum in the right-hand side of (27) is always zero.

Entropic uncertainty relations in the first scenario are based on an additional observation. Let Y be the first of the two measured observables. As was mentioned above, the first-measurement output $\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and the input state $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ share the same density function $w_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(y)$. Due to (33), they also have the same distribution $P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)$, whence

$$R_\alpha\big(P;\boldsymbol{\rho}\big) = R_\alpha\big(P;\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \, , \tag{53}$$

Rewriting (51) with $\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ instead of $\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)$, we obtain uncertainty relations in the first scenario of successive measurements due to (53). If positive numbers α and β obey $1/\alpha + 1/\beta = 2$, then

$$R_\alpha\big(P;\boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + R_\beta\big(Q;\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \geq \ln 2\pi \ . \tag{54}$$

Thus, we formulated uncertainty relations for successive measurements of canonically conjugate variables in terms of Rényi's entropies of continuous distributions.

To obtain definitely positive quantities, we can use entropies with binning. The only step is to convert (49) and (50) into relations between the corresponding discrete distributions. Instead of $P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\zeta)$, we now deal with the probabilities

$$p_j^{(\zeta')} := \int_{\zeta'_j}^{\zeta'_{j+1}} P_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\zeta \ , \tag{55}$$

which form the distribution $\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')}$. The basic size of discretization is $\Delta\zeta = \max\Delta\zeta'_j$, where $\Delta\zeta'_j = \zeta'_{j+1} - \zeta'_j$. For the second probability density function, we introduce the probabilities

$$q_k^{(\xi')} := \int_{\xi'_k}^{\xi'_{k+1}} Q_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\xi)\,\mathrm{d}\xi \ . \tag{56}$$

They form the second probability distribution $\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')}$. We also put the intervals $\Delta\xi'_k = \xi'_{k+1} - \xi'_k$ and their maximum $\Delta\xi = \max\Delta\xi'_k$. Combining (49) and (50) with the corresponding results of the form (12) and (13), the following conclusion takes place. Under the conditions $1/\alpha + 1/\beta = 2$ and $\alpha > 1 > \beta$, we have

$$\big\|\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')}\big\|_\alpha \leq \left(\frac{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}{2\pi}\right)^{(1-\beta)/\beta} \big\|\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')}\big\|_\beta \ , \tag{57}$$

$$\big\|\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')}\big\|_\alpha \leq \left(\frac{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}{2\pi}\right)^{(1-\beta)/\beta} \big\|\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')}\big\|_\beta \ . \tag{58}$$

Entropic uncertainty relations with binning are derived from (57) and (58) similarly to the way by which the results (52) and (54) follow from (49) and (50). In terms of Rényi entropies, we have

$$R_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')};\boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + R_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')};\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \geq \ln\left(\frac{2\pi}{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}\right), \tag{59}$$

$$\int R_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')};\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big)P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\zeta + \int R_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')};\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big)P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\zeta \geq \ln\left(\frac{2\pi}{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}\right), \tag{60}$$

where $1/\alpha + 1/\beta = 2$. Non-zero lower bounds imply a trade-off between values of the first and second entropic measures of uncertainties in each of the formulas (59) and (60). To ensure positive bounds, the interval characteristics $\Delta\zeta$ and $\Delta\xi$ should be chosen small enough. It is connected with the fact that one quantum degree of freedom occupies a dimensionless phase cell with a size not less than 2π. As was already noted right after (12) and (13), entropies with binning becomes generally unbounded in the limit of zero bins. In this limit, the inequalities (59) and (60) do not give an informative statement. Instead, we can use here (52) and (54).

To get uncertainty relations in terms of Rényi entropies, purely algebraic operations were used. The case of Tsallis entropies is not so immediate. Our approach is based on the method of [72], where the minimization problem was examined. We refrain from presenting the details here. The results are formulated as follows. Let strictly positive numbers α and β obey $1/\alpha + 1/\beta = 2$. For any input state $\boldsymbol{\rho}$, we have

$$H_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')};\boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + H_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')};\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \geq \ln_\mu\left(\frac{2\pi}{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}\right), \tag{61}$$

$$\int H_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')};\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big)P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\zeta + \int H_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')};\boldsymbol{\varrho}(\zeta)\big)P_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\zeta \geq \ln_\mu\left(\frac{2\pi}{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}\right), \tag{62}$$

where $\mu = \max\{\alpha,\beta\}$. Hence, uncertainty relations in both the scenarios of successive measurements of canonically conjugate operators are expressed in terms of Tsallis entropies. These entropic uncertainty relations also show complementarity in successive measurements of general canonically conjugate operators.

We finally consider the position and momentum operators, which give a primary case of the canonical commutation relation. Here, the above entropic uncertainty relations can be improved. In general, the Riesz theorem *per se* provides only an upper bound on the corresponding norm of a linear transformation. Calculating exact value of the required norm may lead to improved relations. For the Fourier transform, the exact value was found by Beckner [7]. As was shown by Białynicki-Birula and Mycielski [8], this result implies an improvement of Hirschman's uncertainty relation [6]. The wave functions in the position and momentum spaces are connected via the Fourier transform. Using the Beckner result, we replace 2π with $\varkappa\pi$ in the formulas (43) and (44). The square of $\varkappa$ is expressed as [50]

$$\varkappa^2 = \alpha^{1/(\alpha-1)}\beta^{1/(\beta-1)} \, . \tag{63}$$

The parameter $\varkappa$ grows from $\varkappa = 2$ for $\beta = 1/2$ up to $\varkappa = e$ for $\beta = 1$. In the first scenario, we finally obtain

$$R_\alpha\big(P;\boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + R_\beta\big(Q;\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \geq \ln\varkappa\pi \ , \tag{64}$$

$$R_\alpha\big(\mathsf{p}_\Delta^{(\zeta')};\boldsymbol{\rho}\big) + R_\beta\big(\mathsf{q}_\Delta^{(\xi')};\Phi_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})\big) \geq \ln\left(\frac{\varkappa\pi}{\Delta\zeta\Delta\xi}\right), \tag{65}$$

where $1/\alpha + 1/\beta = 2$. In a similar manner, we recast the uncertainty relations (52) and (60) concerning the second scenario of successive measurements. In terms of the Tsallis entropies, we merely rewrite the right-hand sides of (61) and (62) with $\varkappa\pi$ instead of 2π. In the

case $\alpha = \beta = 1$, all the above relations are expressed via the Shannon entropies. In the lower bounds, the term $\varkappa\pi$ then becomes $e\pi$. The right-hand side of (65) was derived as entropic bounds in [50]. However, that paper concerns the traditional formulation of two independent measurements in the same pre-measurement state. Such lower bounds remain sometimes valid for the scenarios of successive measurements.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have formulated entropic uncertainty relations for successive measurements of general canonically conjugate observables. As canonical conjugacy plays a crucial role in physics, all its aspects deserve investigations. Studies of scenarios with successive measurements are essential from several viewpoints. As was noticed in sect. 5.5 of [61], the concept of wave function reduction becomes of interest only if one performs at least two successive measurements on a system. The most traditional scenario is known as preparation uncertainty relations. However, this picture seems to be too idealized. It differs from the Heisenberg's thought experiment [1], whence uncertainty relations are all originated. Also, the considered successive measurements are not projective. It was shown that entropic measures of uncertainty for such measurements should be introduced in a manner different from the case of finite-dimensional observables. One of distinctions concerns a proper form of the state right after the first measurement. The post-first-measurement state was chosen according to the two possible scenarios.

Successive measurements of observables with continuous spectra depend on acceptance functions of the apparatuses. It was shown how to treat such measurements within entropic approach. The entropic uncertainty relations derived explicitly reveal complementarity in successive measurements of canonically conjugate operators. The presented results give evidence that entropic uncertainty bounds of the traditional formulation may hold in more realistic situations. We examined the case when the conjugate observables both have continuous spectra. Similar ideas can be applied to such pairs as the angle-angular momentum pair and the optical phase-number pair. The latter may need an additional consideration due to a construction of the Hermitian phase operator. We hope to address this case in future investigations. One of open questions is to get information-theoretic formulation of noise-disturbance relations for canonically conjugate variables. In finite dimensions, such approaches were proposed in [73, 74].

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to anonymous referees for valuable comments.

[1] W. Heisenberg, Z. Phys. **43**, 172 (1927).
[2] E. H. Kennard, Z. Phys. **44**, 326 (1927).
[3] H. P. Robertson, Phys. Rev. **34**, 163 (1929).
[4] D. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 631 (1983).
[5] H. Maassen and J. B. M. Uffink, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1103 (1988).
[6] I. I. Hirschman, Amer. J. Math. **79**, 152 (1957).
[7] W. Beckner, Ann. Math. **102**, 159 (1975).
[8] I. Białynicki-Birula and J. Mycielski, Commun. Math. Phys. **44**, 129 (1975).
[9] S. P. Walborn, B. G. Taketani, A. Salles, F. Toscano, and R. L. de Matos Filho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 050401 (2009).
[10] Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 052124 (2011).
[11] S. Wehner and A. Winter, New J. Phys. **12**, 025009 (2010).
[12] I. Białynicki-Birula and Ł. Rudnicki, in: Statistical Complexity, edited by K. D. Sen (Springer, Berlin, 2011), 1–34.
[13] P. J. Coles, M. Berta, M. Tomamichel, and S. Wehner, E-print arXiv:1511.04857 [quant-ph] (2015).
[14] K. Abdelkhalek, R. Schwonnek, H. Maassen, F. Furrer, J. Duhme, P. Raynal, B.-G. Englert, and R. F. Werner, E-print arXiv:1509.00398 [quant-ph] (2015).
[15] Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 024101 (2012).
[16] L. Maccone and A. K. Pati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 260401 (2014).
[17] Z. Puchała, Ł. Rudnicki, and K. Życzkowski, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **46**, 272002 (2013).
[18] S. Friedland, V. Gheorghiu, and G. Gour, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 230401 (2013).
[19] Ł. Rudnicki, Z. Puchała, and K. Życzkowski, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 052115 (2014).
[20] Ł. Rudnicki, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032123 (2015).
[21] A. E. Rastegin and K. Życzkowski, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **49**, 355301 (2016).
[22] C. Mukhopadhyay, N. Shukla, and A. K. Pati, Europhys. Lett. **113**, 50002 (2015).
[23] V. Narasimhachar, A. Poostindouz, and G. Gour, New J. Phys. **18**, 033019 (2016).
[24] M. D. Srinivas, Pramana J. Phys. **60**, 1137 (2003).
[25] J. Distler and S. Paban, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062112 (2013).
[26] M. Berta, M. Christandl, R. Colbeck, J. M. Renes and R. Renner, Nature Phys. **6**, 659 (2010).
[27] M. Tomamichel and R. Renner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 110506 (2011).
[28] N. H. Y. Ng, M. Berta, and S. Wehner, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 042315 (2012).
[29] D. Wineland, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **525**, 739 (2013).
[30] S. Haroche, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **525**, 753 (2013).
[31] P. Busch, P. Lahti, and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 160405 (2013).
[32] M. Ozawa, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042105 (2003).
[33] M. Ozawa, Ann. Phys. **311**, 350 (2004).

[34] K. Baek, T. Farrow, and W. Son, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 032108 (2014).
[35] J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and C.-S. Yu, Quantum Inf. Process. **14**, 2239 (2015).
[36] A. E. Rastegin, Commun. Theor. Phys. **63**, 687 (2015).
[37] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
[38] A. Rényi, in: Proceedings of the 4th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, edited by J. Neyman (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1961), 547–561.
[39] P. Jizba and T. Arimitsu, Ann. Phys. **312**, 17 (2004)
[40] C. Tsallis, J. Stat. Phys. **52**, 479 (1988).
[41] J. Havrda and F. Charvát, Kybernetika **3**, 30 (1967).
[42] A. E. Rastegin, Ann. Phys. **355**, 241 (2015).
[43] A. E. Rastegin, Graphs Combin., DOI:10.1007/s00373-016-1731-x.
[44] I. Białynicki-Birula, Phys. Lett. A **103**, 253 (1984).
[45] I. Białynicki-Birula, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052101 (2006).
[46] D. S. Tasca, Ł. Rudnicki, R. M. Gomes, F. Toscano, and S. P. Walborn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 210502 (2013).
[47] J. Schneeloch, P. B. Dixon, G. A. Howland, C. J. Broadbent, and J. C. Howell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 130407 (2013).
[48] J. Schneeloch, C. J. Broadbent, and J. C. Howell, Phys. Lett. A **378**, 766 (2014).
[49] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Polya, Inequalities (Cambridge University Press, London, 1934).
[50] A. E. Rastegin, Found. Phys. **45**, 923 (2015).
[51] D. T. Pegg and S. M. Barnett, Europhys. Lett. **6**, 483 (1988).
[52] S. M. Barnett and D. T. Pegg, J. Mod. Opt. **36**, 7 (1989).
[53] D. T. Pegg and S. M. Barnett, Phys. Rev. A **39**, 1665 (1989).
[54] P. A. M. Dirac, Proc. R. Soc. A **114**, 243 (1927).
[55] R. Lynch, Phys. Rep. **256**, 367 (1995).
[56] P. Carruthers and M. M. Nieto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **40**, 411 (1968).
[57] D. T. Pegg, J. A. Vaccaro, and S. M. Barnett, J. Mod. Opt. **37**, 1703 (1990).
[58] A. R. Gonzalez, J. A. Vaccaro, and S. M. Barnett, Phys. Lett. A **205**, 247 (1995).
[59] J. Schwinger, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **46**, 570 (1960).
[60] M. Riesz, Acta Math. **49**, 465 (1927).
[61] J.-L. Basdevant and J. Dalibard, Quantum Mechanics (Springer, Berlin, 2002).
[62] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
[63] A. E. Rastegin, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 032136 (2016).
[64] A. Teixeira, A. Matos, and L. Antunes, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **58**, 4273 (2012).
[65] S. Furuichi, J. Math. Phys. **47**, 023302 (2006).
[66] A. E. Rastegin, Kybernetika **48**, 242 (2012).
[67] A. E. Rastegin, Quantum Inf. Comput. **16**, 0313 (2016).
[68] A. E. Rastegin, RAIRO–Theor. Inf. Appl. **49**, 67 (2015).
[69] R. de la Madrid, A. Bohm, and M. Gadella, Fortschr. Phys. **50**, 185 (2002).
[70] D. I. Blokhintsev, Space and Time in the Microworld (D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, 1973).
[71] Ł. Rudnicki, D. S. Tasca, and S. P. Walborn, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 022109 (2016).
[72] A. E. Rastegin, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **44**, 095303 (2011).
[73] F. Buscemi, M. J. W. Hall, M. Ozawa, and M. M. Wilde, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 050401 (2014).
[74] P. J. Coles and F. Furrer, Phys. Lett. A **379**, 105 (2015).